



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/473,136

12/28/1999

THOMAS F. BERGERT

9633

7590 05/08/2009  
THOMAS F BERGERT  
6429 WOODBOURNE LN.  
CROZET, VA 22932

EXAMINER
----------

GILLIGAN, CHRISTOPHER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/08/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2  
3  
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5 AND INTERFERENCES  
6

7  
8 *Ex parte* THOMAS F. BERGERT  
9

10  
11 Appeal 2008-4902  
12 Application 09/473,136  
13 Technology Center 3600  
14

15  
16 Decided:<sup>1</sup> May 8, 2009  
17

18  
19 *Before* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, JOSEPH A. FISCHETTI and BIBHU  
20 R. MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

21  
22 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge*.  
23

24  
25 DECISION ON APPEAL

26  
27 STATEMENT OF THE CASE

---

<sup>1</sup>The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, begins to run from the decided date shown on this page of the decision. The time period does not run from the Mail Date (paper delivery) or Notification Date (electronic delivery).

1 Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a Final  
2 Rejection of claims 1-9, 11 and 13-23. We have jurisdiction under 35  
3 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

4 Appellant invented systems and methods for making on-line  
5 reservations for recreational outings (Specification 1).

6 Claim 1, reproduced below, is further illustrative of the claimed  
7 subject matter:

- 8 1. A method of arranging a recreational  
9 outing for participants using a computer,  
10 comprising the steps of
  - 11 a) providing a database of information  
12 including reservation information, said reservation  
13 information including at least one selection option,  
14 said option including a time and a date for an  
15 activity from a plurality of recreational facilities,  
16 said database further including profile information  
17 for a plurality of said participants, said profile  
18 information for each of said plurality of  
19 participants including at least one element;  
20 b) receiving a non-facility specific request  
21 pertaining to a plurality of facilities for at least one  
22 selection option;  
23 c) retrieving and transmit, based on said  
24 received request, at least one selection option  
25 pertaining to at least one available reservation;  
26 d) receiving a selection from a first one of  
27 said participants of a selection option;  
28 e) receiving indication information including  
29 a selection from said first participant of at least one  
30 element corresponding to an element of said  
31 profile information of at least one additional  
32 participant;  
33 f) determining a subset of said participants  
34 from said database of participants having said  
35 profile element;

1                   g) communicating said selection to said  
2           subset of participants;  
3                   h) receiving acceptance information from at  
4           least one other participant using a client computer  
5           and  
6                   i) after receiving said acceptance  
7           information in step h), receiving instructions from  
8           said first participant using a client computer to  
9           book a reservation for the time and date and  
10          facility connected with said selection option.

11  
12          The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on  
13   appeal is:

14          Davies	US 5,596,636	Jan. 21, 1997
15          Henneuse	US 5,963,913	Oct. 5, 1999
16          Zhang	US 6,016,478	Jan. 18, 2000
17          Durand	US 6,272,467 B1	Aug. 7, 2001

18  
19          Michael L. Kasavana, *Making more hours in the day*, 72 Club  
20          Management, 79 (1993) (hereinafter “Kasavana”);

21  
22          Christina Valdez Diaz, *Road Warriors plot their course early*, USA  
23          Today, Sep. 23, 1997 at E, 4:1 (hereinafter “Diaz”).

24  
25          James Romanesko, *Teemaster Speeds Booking Tee Times*, Saint Paul  
26          Pioneer Press, Mar. 16, 1998 (hereinafter “Teemaster”);

27  
28          Golf Agent, Your Internet Link, Golf Club Bookings via the Internet,  
29          [http://web.archive.org/web/19970331023023/www.golfagent.com/cgi-](http://web.archive.org/web/19970331023023/www.golfagent.com/cgi-win//ClubSearch.exe)  
30          win//ClubSearch.exe (last visited May 22, 2003) (hereinafter  
31          “GolfAgent”);

32  
33  
34          The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 9, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C.  
35   § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies in view of Durand, Teemaster  
36   and Henneuse; rejected claims 14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

1 unpatentable over Davies in view of Durand, Teemaster, Henneuse and  
2 Zhang; rejected claims 17 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
3 unpatentable over Davies in view of GolfAgent, Teemaster, Henneuse and  
4 Kasavana; rejected claims 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
5 unpatentable over Davies in view of GolfAgent, Teemaster, Henneuse and  
6 Zhang; rejected claims 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
7 unpatentable over GolfAgent in view of Davies, Teemaster and Henneuse;  
8 rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies  
9 in view of Durand, Teemaster, Henneuse, and Kasavana; rejected claims 6  
10 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies in view of  
11 Durand, Teemaster, Henneuse and Diaz; rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C.  
12 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies in view of Durand, Teemaster,  
13 Henneuse, Diaz and Official Notice; rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C.  
14 § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davies in view of Durand, Teemaster,  
15 Henneuse and Kasavana; and rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as  
16 being unpatentable over Davies in view of Zhang, GolfAgent, Teemaster,  
17 Henneuse and Kasavana.

18 We REVERSE.

19  
20 ISSUES

21 Did the Appellant show the Examiner erred in finding that the  
22 reservation request and confirmation system of Davies discloses receiving a  
23 selection from a first one of said participants of a selection option, as recited  
24 in independent claim 1, where independent claim 1 also recites receiving

1 instructions from said first participant using a client computer to book a  
2 reservation for the time and date and facility connected with said selection  
3 option?

4 Did the Appellant show the Examiner erred in asserting that the event  
5 scheduling system of Henneuse discloses providing access to a database of  
6 information including reservation information including at least one  
7 selection option including a number of openings available for one or more  
8 additional individuals to join an activity, and receiving indication  
9 information from the first participant including information necessary to  
10 notify a number of individuals of said selection, the number of individuals  
11 being greater than the number of available openings as recited in  
12 independent claims 17, 18 and 21?

## 14 FINDINGS OF FACT

### 15 *Specification*

16 Appellant invented systems and methods for making on-line  
17 reservations for recreational outings (Specification 1).

18 The recreational activity may be golf and the number of available  
19 slots is limited by the number of golfers in the reservation (Specification 10).

### 21 *Davies*

22 Davies discloses an automated golf reservation system 17 including a  
23 golf course host computer data base 16 (col. 2, ll. 39-44; col. 3, ll. 37-39).

24 A user enters desired primary and alternate reservation information  
25 into Teephone unit 10. Teephone unit 10 then dials into system 17 with  
26 primary desired reservation information, including time and date, and

1 several alternate options in case the primary desired reservation information  
2 is not available (col. 3, ll. 37-41; col. 4, ll. 26-35).

3 The system 17 then sends confirmation information to Teephone unit  
4 10 if one of the desired reservation information is accepted (col. 4, ll. 35-37).

5  
6 *Henneuse*

7 Henneuse discloses systems and methods for scheduling an event  
8 subject to the availability of requested participants using server application  
9 16. Server application 16 receives event information from the scheduler in  
10 step 20 (col. 3, ll. 9-14).

11 Server application 16 then sends an electronic mail message to each  
12 requested participant where each message includes a link to the event reply  
13 page. The reply page may include the name of the scheduler, the name of  
14 the event, and one or more options defined by the scheduler, such as one or  
15 more potential schedules for the event (col. 3, ll. 30-51).

16  
17 PRINCIPLES OF LAW

18 *Claim Construction*

19 Unless the steps of a method actually recite an  
20 order, the steps are not ordinarily construed to  
21 require one. *See Loral Fairchild Corp. v. Sony*  
22 *Corp.*, 181 F.3d 1313, 1322, 50 USPQ2d 1865,  
23 1870 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (stating that “not every  
24 process claim is limited to the performance of its  
25 steps in the order written”). However, such a  
26 result can ensue when the method steps implicitly  
27 require that they be performed in the order written.  
28 *See Loral*, 181 F.3d at 1322, 50 USPQ2d at 1870  
29 (stating that “the language of the claim, the  
30 specification and the prosecution history support a

1 limiting construction[, in which the steps must be  
2 performed in the order written,] in this case”);  
3 *Mantech*, 152 F.3d at 1376, 47 USPQ2d at 1739  
4 (holding that “the sequential nature of the claim  
5 steps is apparent from the plain meaning of the  
6 claim language and nothing in the written  
7 description suggests otherwise”).  
8

9 *Interactive Gift Express, Inc. v. CompuServe Inc.*, 256 F.3d 1323, 1342-43  
10 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

11 The context of the surrounding words of the claim must be considered  
12 in determining the ordinary and customary meaning of those terms. *ACTV,*  
13 *Inc. v. Walt Disney Co.*, 346 F.3d 1082, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

14 Two distinct claim elements should each be given full effect. *Unique*  
15 *Concepts, Inc. v. Brown*, 939 F.2d 1558, 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

16 Claim language cannot be mere surplusage. An express limitation  
17 cannot be read out of the claim. *Texas Instruments Inc. v. United States Int'l*  
18 *Trade Comm'n*, 988 F.2d 1165, 1171 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

19 “[T]he specification is always highly relevant to the claim  
20 construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to  
21 the meaning of a disputed term.” *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90  
22 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996).

23  
24 *Obviousness*

25 “Section 103 forbids issuance of a patent when ‘the differences  
26 between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such  
27 that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the  
28 invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said  
29 subject matter pertains.’” *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 406



(2007). The question of obviousness is resolved on the basis of underlying factual determinations including (1) the scope and content of the prior art, (2) any differences between the claimed subject matter and the prior art, and (3) the level of skill in the art. *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966). *See also KSR*, 550 U.S. at 407 (“While the sequence of these questions might be reordered in any particular case, the [*Graham*] factors continue to define the inquiry that controls.”)

## ANALYSIS

### *Selection Option*

We are persuaded of error on the part of the Examiner by Appellant’s argument that the reservation request and confirmation system of Davies does not disclose receiving a selection from a first one of said participants of a selection option, as recited in independent claim 1 (Appeal Brief 7-8, 11; Reply Brief 3-4). Davies discloses that Teephone unit 10 interacts with automated golf reservation system 17 to make and confirm a reservation. The Examiner asserts that this corresponds to receiving a selection from a first one of said participants of a selection option as recited in independent claim 1 (Examiner’s Answer 5-6, 24-25).<sup>2</sup>

Independent claim 1, however, also requires receiving instructions from said first participant using a client computer to book a reservation for

---

<sup>2</sup> The user’s interaction with Teephone unit 10, prior to its interaction with system 17, cannot correspond to the receiving a selection step, as other portions of the claim, also cited as being disclosed by Davies, recite that the selection option is from the database (i.e., system 17). The user cannot “select” a selection option before the selection option has been provided to Teephone unit 10 from system 17. *See ACTV, Inc.*, 346 F.3d at 1088; *Interactive Gift Express, Inc.*, 256 F.3d at 1342-43.

1 the time and date and facility connected with said selection option. As claim  
2 terms should be construed in the context of other claim terms, the receiving  
3 a selection step must be construed in view of the receiving instructions step.  
4 *See ACTV, Inc.*, 346 F.3d at 1088.

5 Under the Examiner's construction, both the receiving a selection step  
6 and the receiving instructions step would book a reservation, the receiving a  
7 selection step because the corresponding portion of Davies books a  
8 reservation, and the receiving instructions step because the rest of the step  
9 explicitly recites booking a reservation. There are two possible claim  
10 interpretation paths that may be taken to resolve this quandary, however,  
11 neither are allowed in a proper claim construction.

12 The first path involves collapsing both receiving steps into a single  
13 step, i.e., *both* receiving steps would be fulfilled by the cited portions of  
14 Davies. However, two distinct claim elements should each be given full  
15 effect. *Unique Concepts, Inc.*, 939 F.2d at 1563. This is especially true  
16 where the receiving a selection step must occur *before* the receiving  
17 instructions step, because the receiving instructions step is dependent on a  
18 response flowing from the receiving a selection step. *See Interactive Gift*  
19 *Express, Inc.*, 256 F.3d at 1342-43.

20 As Davies has been cited as only corresponding to the receiving a  
21 selection step, another reference must be cited as corresponding to the  
22 receiving instructions step. However, the reservation has *already been*  
23 *booked* in the receiving a selection step of Davies. One of ordinary skill in  
24 the art would not have a reason to combine the cited portions of Davies with  
25 another reference to apparently *rebook the same reservation*, this time under

1 the receiving instructions step, as would be required under the current  
2 interpretation of these steps in independent claim 1.

3 The second path involves eliminating one of the receiving steps since  
4 only one reservation is booked. The cited portions of Davies would then  
5 correspond to the one and only receiving step that includes booking the one  
6 and only reservation. However, claim language cannot be mere surplusage,  
7 as an express limitation cannot be read out of the claim. *Texas Instruments*  
8 *Inc.*, 988 F.2d at 1171. Accordingly, eliminating one of the receiving steps  
9 of independent claim 1 is not a permissible option.

10  
11 *Number of Openings*

12 We are also persuaded of error on the part of the Examiner by  
13 Appellant's argument that the event scheduling system of Henneuse does not  
14 disclose reservation information including a number of openings available  
15 for one or more additional individuals to join an activity, the number of  
16 individuals being greater than the number of available openings, as recited in  
17 independent claims 17, 18 and 21 (Appeal Brief 9, 11; Reply Brief 4-7).

18 The Examiner asserts that Henneuse discloses the number of openings  
19 because by inviting people, the event inherently has one or more openings  
20 (Examiner's Answer 28-29). The Examiner may be correct if the claim  
21 merely recited *at least one* opening. However, the claims recite that the  
22 reservation information includes *the number* of openings, which requires an  
23 actual number, especially in view of the later recitations in the claims that  
24 the number of individuals is greater than the number of available openings.  
25 *See ACTV, Inc.*, 346 F.3d at 1088. This interpretation is confirmed by the  
26 Specification, where the number of openings is used in the context of a

1 limited number of slots in a golf reservation. *See Vitronics Corp.*, 90 F.3d at  
2 1582. Henneuse does not disclose that an actual number of openings is  
3 provided on the reply page.

4       The Examiner also asserts that Henneuse discloses that the number of  
5 individuals is greater than the number of available openings because less  
6 than all of the requested participants have accepted the event invitation  
7 (Examiner's Answer 28-29). However, because the cited portions do not  
8 disclose space restrictions, the most reasonable interpretation of Henneuse is  
9 that should an invited individual desire to attend the event at a certain time,  
10 an opening is available for them. The fact that they cannot attend does not  
11 mean that the opening is not available. It merely means they will not attend.  
12 If anything, the fact that only a *subset* of invited individuals will show up to  
13 an event at a certain time, when every indication is that they could *all* be  
14 accommodated, shows that there are *more* available openings than number  
15 of individuals. Accordingly, Henneuse discloses that the number of  
16 individuals is *less than or equal to* the number of available openings, and not  
17 *greater than* as required by independent claims 17, 18 and 21.

18  
19       *Other Claims*

20       As the rejections of independent claims 1, 17, 18 and 21 have been  
21 reversed, the rejections of dependent claims 2-9, 11, 13-16, 19, 20, 22 and  
22 23 are also reversed.

CONCLUSION

The Appellant has shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claims  
1-9, 11 and 13-23.

REVERSED

hh

THOMAS F. BERGERT  
6429 WOODBOURNE LN.  
CROZET, VA 22932